



RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUN 09 2008

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10012900-1

IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Travis J. Parry

Confirmation No.: 8769

Application No.: 10/086,748

Examiner: Laurel L. Lashley

Filing Date: February 28, 2002

Group Art Unit: 2132

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on April 8, 2008.

☒ The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is \$510.00 (37 CFR 41.20).☒ No Additional Fee Required.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:☐ 1st Month  
\$120☐ 2nd Month  
\$460☐ 3rd Month  
\$1050☐ 4th Month  
\$1640☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$ 510 . At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

☐ A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.

Date of facsimile: June 9, 2008

Typed Name: Scott A. Lund

Signature: 

Rev 10/07 (Ap/Brief)

Respectfully submitted,

Travis J. Parry

By: 

Scott A. Lund

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No.: 41,168

Date: June 9, 2008

Telephone: 612.573.2006

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Examiner: Laurel L. Lashley

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Group Art Unit: 2132

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JUN 09 2008****APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37****Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir/Madam:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed April 8, 2008, appealing the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, and 24-34 of the above-identified application as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge **Deposit Account No. 08-2025** in the amount of **\$510.00** for filing a Brief in Support of an Appeal as set forth under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2). At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any required fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Appellant respectfully requests reconsideration and reversal of the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, and 24-34.

06/10/2008 VBUI11 00000019 002025 10086746

01 FC:1402

510.00 DA

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUN 09 2008**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Real Party in Interest .....	3
Related Appeals and Interferences .....	3
Status of Claims.....	3
Status of Amendments.....	3
Summary of The Claimed Subject Matter.....	3
Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal .....	5
Argument.....	5
Conclusion.....	11
Claims Appendix .....	12
Evidence Appendix.....	17
Related Proceedings Appendix.....	18

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, LP having a principal place of business at 20555 S.H. 249 Houston, TX 77070, U.S.A. (hereinafter "HPDC"). HPDC is a Texas limited partnership and is a wholly-owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company, a Delaware corporation, headquartered in Palo Alto, CA. The general or managing partner of HPDC is HPQ Holdings, LLC.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant submits that there are no related appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal.

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, and 24-34 are pending in the application (see Claims Appendix), and are the subject of the present Appeal. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, and 23 were previously cancelled without prejudice.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

In the Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention (viz., antecedent basis). In an Amendment and Response filed April 8, 2008 in reply to the Final Office Action, Appellant amended claim 24 to correct antecedent basis. In the Advisory Action mailed April 25, 2008, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment would be entered. The claims listed in the Claims Appendix, therefore, reflect the claims as of April 25, 2008.

**SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

One aspect of the present invention, as claimed in independent claim 1, provides a printer (50) including a processor (52); a printing component (54) in communication with the processor; and a filtering program stored in a memory device (58) or firmware (60) of the printer and associated with the processor so as to evaluate (16) a file received at the printer

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

and control printing of the file by the printing component based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including the file, wherein if the at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic (24), processing of the file by the printer is terminated and printing of the file by the printer is prevented (20,21), and wherein if the at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic (24), processing of the file by the printer proceeds and printing of the file by the printer is conducted (22) (see, e.g., Figs. 1, 3, 5, and 6; para. [0027] - [0030], para. [0036]).

One aspect of the present invention, as claimed in independent claim 11, provides a method for filtering data received by a printer (50). The method includes transmitting (14) an unfiltered printing packet comprising at least one file from a source computer, across a network, to a printer of the network; receiving the unfiltered printing packet at the printer; evaluating (16) at the printer at least one prespecified characteristic of the printing packet by a processor (52) housed within the printer; and controlling processing of the at least one file of the printing packet by the printer based on the evaluating, including preventing (20,21) processing and printing of the at least one file by the printer if the at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic (24), and permitting (22) processing and printing of said at least one file by said printer if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic (24) (see, e.g., Figs. 1, 3, 5, and 6; para. [0027] - [0030], para. [0036]).

One aspect of the present invention, as claimed in independent claim 20, provides a system for filtering a file transmitted to a printer (50/50'), with the printer including a processor (52/52') in communication with a network (30) across which at least one file has been transmitted; and a filtering program associated with the processor so as to evaluate the at least one file at the printer and control printing of the at least one file by the printer based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including the at least one file, wherein printing of the at least one file by the printer is prevented (20,21) if the at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic (24), and wherein printing of the at least one file by the printer is conducted (22) if the at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic (24) (see, e.g., Figs. 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7; para. [0027] - [0030], para. [0036], para. [0039]).

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Appellant seeks review of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 26-28, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rourke et al. US Patent No. 5,077,795 further in view of Docter et al. US Patent No. 6,330,610.

Appellant seeks review of the rejection of claims 24, 25, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rourke et al. US Patent No. 5,077,795 and Docter et al. US Patent No. 6,330,610 further in view of Kawamura US Patent No. 5,731,882.

**ARGUMENT**

**I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**A. Applicable Law**

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. 103, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In so doing, the Examiner must make the factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966). "[T]he examiner bears the initial burden, on review of the prior art or on any other ground, of presenting a *prima facie* case of unpatentability." *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In identifying a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the prior art teachings, the Examiner must show some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *KSR Int'l. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). "[T]here must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343-46 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-59 (Fed. Cir. 1998)).

Further, a rejection based on section 103 must rest upon a factual basis rather than conjecture, or speculation. "Where the legal conclusion [of obviousness] is not supported by the facts it cannot stand." *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017 (CCPA 1967). *See also In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d at 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

**B. Rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 26-28, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C.**

**103(a)**

Because the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 26-28, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rourke et al. US Patent No. 5,077,795 further in view of Docter et al. US Patent No. 6,330,610 fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 26-28, and 30-34 is not correct and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 includes "a filtering program stored in a memory device or firmware of said printer and associated with said processor so as to evaluate a file received at said printer and control printing of said file by said printing component based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said file," wherein "if said at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, processing of said file by said printer is terminated and printing of said file by said printer is prevented," and wherein "if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic, processing of said file by said printer proceeds and printing of said file by said printer is conducted."

Independent claim 11 includes "controlling processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said printer based on said evaluating, including preventing processing and printing of said at least one file by said printer if said at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and permitting processing and printing of said at least one file by said printer if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic."

Independent claim 20 includes "a filtering program associated with said processor so as to evaluate said at least one file at said printer and control printing of said at least one file by said printer based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said at least one file," wherein "printing of said at least one file by said printer is prevented if said at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic," and wherein "printing of said at least one file by said printer is conducted if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic."

With respect to the Rourke, Docter, and Kawamura references, Appellant submits that these references, individually or in combination, do not disclose a printer as claimed in



**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

independent claim 1, do not disclose a method as claimed in independent claim 11, and do not disclose a system as claimed in independent claim 20 including evaluating a file at a printer and controlling printing of the file by the printer based on a prespecified characteristic from a packet including the file, wherein processing of the file by the printer is terminated and/or printing of the file by the printer is prevented if the prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and wherein processing of the file by the printer proceeds and/or printing of the file by the printer is conducted if the prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic.

The Examiner recognizes that the Rourke reference does not disclose a filtering program as claimed in independent claims 1, 11, and 20 (Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, page 4), and contends that the Docter reference does disclose a filtering program as claimed in independent claims 1, 11, and 20 (Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, pages 4-5). As such, the Examiner submits that at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the printing system of Rourke et al. such that it would incorporate a filtering program as in Docter et al. (Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, page 5).

More specifically, the Examiner relies on the Docter reference as disclosing a filtering system which "...evaluates/analyzes files or documents based on specified characteristics, parameters, or criteria to determine...which files or documents are to actually be printed" (Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, page 3). As such, the Examiner suggests that "[i]t is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a filtering system either enables or disables functionality from occurring," and suggests that "the enabled or prohibited functionality is to process or terminate printing" (Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, page 3).

Appellant submits, however, that the Docter reference does not disclose a filtering system that either enables or disables functionality from occurring wherein the enabled or prohibited functionality is to process or terminate printing. Rather, the Docter reference provides a system capable of filtering data in multiple stages, with each stage of filtering using different filtering criteria (col. 1, lines 7-9). More specifically, the Docter reference provides that in a first stage, data filtering can be performed by a server (i.e., a first device) using non-private filtering criteria wherein the data that passes through the filter at the first

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

stage continues to another data filter at a second stage such that the second stage of filtering may be performed by a client or a more trusted server (i.e., a second device), thereby allowing filtering criteria containing private information about the user or organization (col. 3, lines 6-13). The Docter reference, therefore, does not disclose a filtering system that either enables or disables functionality from occurring wherein the enabled or prohibited functionality is to process or terminate printing. More specifically, the Docter reference does not disclose evaluating a file at a printer and controlling printing of the file by the printer based on a prespecified characteristic from a packet including the file, wherein processing of the file by the printer is terminated and/or printing of the file by the printer is prevented if the prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and wherein processing of the file by the printer proceeds and/or printing of the file by the printer is conducted if the prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic, as claimed in independent claims 1, 11, and 20.

As such, Appellant submits that the Docter reference does not overcome the shortcomings of the Rourke reference. Appellant, therefore, submits that modifying the Rourke reference in view of the Docter reference, in the manner suggested by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 11, and 20. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

In view of the above, Appellant submits that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent claims 1, 11, and 20, and submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 20 are each patentably distinct from the Rourke and Docter references. Furthermore, as dependent claims 5, 8-10, 24, and 30-34 further define patentably distinct claim 1, dependent claims 12, 15-17, and 25 further define patentably distinct claim 11, and dependent claims 21 and 26-29 further define patentably distinct claim 20, Appellant submits that these dependent claims are also patentably distinct from the Rourke and Docter references. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 26-28, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not correct and should be withdrawn, and submits that claims 1, 5, 8-12, 15-17, 20, 21, 26-28, and 30-34 should be allowed.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

**C. Rejection of claims 24, 25, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Because the rejection of claims 24, 25, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rourke et al. US Patent No. 5,077,795 and Docter et al. US Patent No. 6,330,610 further in view of Kawamura US Patent No. 5,731,882 fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejection of claims 24, 25, and 29 is not correct and should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 depends from independent claim 1, claim 25 depends from independent claim 11, and claim 29 depends from independent claim 20 and, as such, each include all of the limitations of the respective independent claims. As outlined above, Appellant submits that the Rourke and Docter references do not disclose evaluating a file at a printer and controlling printing of the file by the printer based on a prespecified characteristic from a packet including the file, wherein processing of the file by the printer is terminated and/or printing of the file by the printer is prevented if the prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and wherein processing of the file by the printer proceeds and/or printing of the file by the printer is conducted if the prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic, as claimed in independent claims 1, 11, and 20.

The Kawamura reference relates to an image communication apparatus, such as a facsimile apparatus, having a receiving device for receiving coded data, a decoder for decoding the coded data received by the receiving device and for conducting an operation for detecting a transmission error in each of plural data lines based on the decoded data, a controller for controlling the operation of the decoder and for generating data to be recorded by conducting decoding of the coded data while removing the coded data of the lines in which a transmission error has been detected, and a recording device for recording an image on a recording sheet in accordance with the data decoded by the controller (Abstract). The Kawamura reference, however, does not disclose evaluating a file at a printer and controlling printing of the file by the printer based on a prespecified characteristic from a packet including the file, wherein processing of the file by the printer is terminated and/or printing of the file by the printer is prevented if the prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and wherein processing of the file by the printer proceeds and/or printing of the file by the printer is conducted if the prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

As such, Appellant submits that the Kawamura reference does not overcome the shortcomings of the Rourke and Docter references. Appellant, therefore, submits that modifying the Rourke and Docter references in view of the Kawamura reference, in the manner suggested by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 24, 25, and 29. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

For at least the reasons set forth above, Appellant submits that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 24, 25, and 29. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 24, 25, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not correct and should be withdrawn, and submits that claims 24, 25, and 29 should be allowed.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that the art of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious the claimed invention. Thus, the claimed invention does patentably distinguish over the art of record. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submits that the above rejections are not correct and should be withdrawn, and respectfully requests that the Examiner be reversed and that all pending claims be allowed.

Any inquiry regarding this Appeal Brief should be directed to either Jeff Limon at Telephone No. (541) 715-5979, Facsimile No. (541) 715-8581 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration  
Legal Department, M/S 35  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Travis J. Parry,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC  
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250  
100 South Fifth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 573-2006  
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: June 9, 2008  
SAL:hsf

  
Scott A. Lund  
Reg. No. 41,166

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 07th day of June, 2008.

By   
Name: Scott A. Lund

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**JUN 09 2008**

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. (Previously Presented) A printer, comprising:  
a processor;  
a printing component in communication with said processor; and  
a filtering program stored in a memory device or firmware of said printer and  
associated with said processor so as to evaluate a file received at said printer  
and control printing of said file by said printing component based on at least  
one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said file,  
wherein if said at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic,  
processing of said file by said printer is terminated and printing of said file by  
said printer is prevented, and  
wherein if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic,  
processing of said file by said printer proceeds and printing of said file by said  
printer is conducted.
- 2-4. (Cancelled)
5. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said at least one prespecified  
characteristic comprises at least one of a file type, a source computer identifier, a user  
identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a  
user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, file string, and time-  
consuming print commands.
- 6-7. (Cancelled)
8. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said filtering program  
instructs said processor to cause said printing component to print said file only if said packet  
lacks said undesirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

9. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

10. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said desirable characteristic comprises one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

11. (Previously Presented) A method for filtering data received by a printer, comprising:  
transmitting an unfiltered printing packet comprising at least one file from a source computer,  
across a network, to a printer of said network;  
receiving said unfiltered printing packet at said printer;  
evaluating at said printer at least one prespecified characteristic of said printing packet by a  
processor housed within said printer; and  
controlling processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said printer based on  
said evaluating, including preventing processing and printing of said at least one file  
by said printer if said at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable  
characteristic, and permitting processing and printing of said at least one file by said  
printer if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic.

12. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, wherein said evaluating at least one  
prespecified characteristic comprises evaluating at least one of a file type, a file string, a  
source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission,  
cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a  
given time, and time-consuming print commands.

13-14. (Cancelled)

15. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, wherein said controlling comprises  
permitting processing of said at least one file of said printing packet by said printer if said  
printing packet lacks said undesirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, wherein said evaluating comprises evaluating said printing packet for at least one said undesirable characteristic comprising at least one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, and at least one prespecified command.

17. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, wherein said evaluating comprises evaluating said printing packet for at least one said desirable characteristic comprising at least one of a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file type, and a password.

18-19. (Cancelled)

20. (Previously Presented) A system for filtering a file transmitted to a printer, comprising:

a printer comprising:

a processor in communication with a network across which at least one file has been transmitted; and

a filtering program associated with said processor so as to evaluate said at least one file at said printer and control printing of said at least one file by said printer based on at least one prespecified characteristic from a packet including said at least one file,

wherein printing of said at least one file by said printer is prevented if said at least one prespecified characteristic is an undesirable characteristic, and

wherein printing of said at least one file by said printer is conducted if said at least one prespecified characteristic is a desirable characteristic.

21. (Original) The system of claim 20, wherein said filtering program is stored by at least one of a memory device and firmware.

22-23. (Cancelled)



**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

24. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein a message is generated if said at least one prespecified characteristic is said undesirable characteristic and processing of said file is terminated.
25. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 11, further comprising:  
sending a message to said source computer if said at least one prespecified characteristic is said undesirable characteristic and processing of said at least one file is prevented.
26. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein said at least one prespecified characteristic comprises at least one of a file type, a file string, a source computer identifier, a user identifier, a file size, a password, time of transmission, cumulative number of files sent by a user, cumulative number of files sent by a user over a given time, and time-consuming print commands.
27. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein said packet, prior to filtering, further includes instructions for said printer, the instructions comprising information about a source of media onto which printing of said at least one file is to be effected, information about orientation in which said at least one file is to be printed on a media, information about whether printing is to be effected on one or two sides of a media, information about a number of copies to be printed, or information about whether multiple copies should be collated.
28. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, further wherein printing is conducted only if said at least one prespecified characteristic lacks said desirable characteristic and has said desirable characteristic.
29. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein a message is generated if said at least one prespecified characteristic is said undesirable characteristic and printing is prevented.
30. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises a file having a certain extension.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

31. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises a file including a particular file string.
32. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises a file size exceeding a maximum threshold.
33. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises one of an identifier for a prespecified source computer and an identifier for a prespecified user.
34. (Previously Presented) The printer of claim 1, wherein said undesirable characteristic comprises a time-consuming print command.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
of the United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Appellant: Travis J. Parry

Serial No.: 10/086,746

Filed: February 28, 2002

Docket No.: 10012900-1

Title: DEVICE-SPECIFIC FIREWALL

---

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.